

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/604,818	08/19/2003	YI-CHEN CHANG	11260-US-PA	1817	
	7590 12/26/2006 N INTELLECTUAL PRO	EXAMINER			
7 FLOOR-1, N	IO. 100	LKIT OFFICE	PERVAN, MICHAEL		
ROOSEVELT TAIPEI, 100	ROAD, SECTION 2		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
TAIWAN		•	2629	<u> </u>	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/26/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/604,818		CHANG, YI-CHEN	
Examiner		Art Unit	
	Michael Pervan	2629	

	Michael Pervan	2629						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 06 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN					
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL								
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since					
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause					
	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a</li></ul>		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s).								
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation o how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-2</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a N Id sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
11. 🗵 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:								
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)								
AMR A. AWAD SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  Amy Away Away								
		· AIENI	-XAMINER					
		Am Almel	AWAY					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented by the applicant are substantially similar to that of the previous and the reply is substantially similar as provided by the previous office action. With regard to pages 3-4 of the argument, the applicant argues that the examiner misunderstood the reference of Kane in that the it is only after the autozero phase in the writing phase that a voltage on the LED is incremented and the capacitor is discharged, since the purpose of the capacitor is to store the data on output (discharge) said data to the LED. The claim does not recite that the capacitor is immediately discharged in response to a scanning control signal, therefore as long as the capacitor discharges as a result of a signal eventually it would read on the claim. As for the reference of Kane, the precharge signal, as admitted by the applicant, causes the the autozero to arise which in turn causes the capacitor to discharge, therfore Kane reads on the claim.